APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution to permit individual States of our Union to apportion the membership of one house of their legislatures on factors other than population.

I have long been hesitant to introduce legislation that would interfere with decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, but on occasion it seems imperative that we do so. On June 14, 1964, the Supreme Court decided that the sovereign States of the Union do not have the authority or the right to apportion one house of their legislatures on the basis of factors other than population alone. Not only do I believe that the decision was wrong, but I believe the sensitive balance between State and Federal powers will be irreparably damaged if the Constitution is not amended to reverse this decision.

The controversy revolves around the Court's interpretation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. History reveals that from its inception, the 14th amendment was never intended to prevent a State from choosing any legislative structure it believed best suited to its needs. In fact, during the debate on the amendment in the House, it was concisely stated that the amendment "takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it." The policy of apportioning one body of a State legislature on factors other than population long preceded the enactment of the 14th amendment. And when the people of the States agreed to form a Union, it was agreed that the political rights of the States should be preserved under the Federal Constitution.

There are now 50 States in our Union, each with separate characteristics, a wide range of local considerations within each involving unique history, geography, topography, climate, distribution of population, political heritage, and individual citizen's economic, political and social interests. I would agree with the Supreme Court that legislators represent people, not trees or acres. But we must also realize that people are not mere numbers and must be considered for their needs.

The majority certainly must have effective rule, and they do. But the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation lest important segments of our people be completely subjected to the will of a temporary majority. To abandon this concept would be to convert the oldest constitutional government in the world to something potentially dangerous to individual liberty.

For these reasons, I have introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so that States may apportion one house of their legislature on the basis of factors other than population.

THE CRIME OF PRESIDENTIAL ASSASSINATION

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would make it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President or Vice President, or anyone in line for the Presidency, including the President-elect and Vice-President-elect.

It was certainly shocking to learn 14 months ago that there was no Federal statute that made it a crime to assassinate the President. Over a year has passed since that tragic day in Dallas when a stunned and mourning Nation watched local authorities, whether rightly or wrongly, handle a case that was obviously one for Federal jurisdiction. It was astounding to learn that the FBI had to wait until local authorities invited them into the case.

Attacks upon a number of lesser Federal officials are covered by the United States Code, but not the men with which the American people have entrusted their future. This bill would eliminate any repetition of those unbelievable circumstances of November 1963.

This bill follows the recommendations of the Warren Commission to make it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President, the Vice President, any other officer next in line of succession to the President, the President-elect, and the Vice-President-elect. I sincerely urge the Congress to approve this proposal at the earliest possible moment.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FRANK J. BECKER

(Mr. WYDLER (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the close of the 88th Congress, I have wanted to take the floor and state my regret that my good friend Frank J. Becker will no longer serve beside me—and guide me—in the 89th Congress.

He was in many ways a man of contradictions—humble and proud, hardheaded, and soft-hearted, unyielding and yet warm.

Frank liked to give; and he gave to me and his fellow man a friendship, love, and dedication that is seldom to be seen and experienced on this earth.

Frank was a man among men; but a conscious child of God. It was fitting that he should choose to retire from Congress and work in the months after his decision with the same intense devotion which marked his career during the last 12 years.

If a Representative is to be worth anything he must be honest, independent, and fiercely determined to do what is right. Frank was worth his salt.

When he retired, the Congress lost its last "angry Congressman." His most ardent opponents will miss him. The Congress is something less without him.

His last act as a Congressman was typically a letter to his constituents. It reveals the man we all knew and something of the man we could only guess at.

I wish to spread it in the RECORD for posterity, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(From your Congressman Frank J. Becker, Fifth District New York, December 16, 1964)

DEAR FRIEND: As we approach the end of another year, I'm writing you from Washington as I wind up my affairs and say finis to my congressional career.

This task is filled with memories and a touch of nostalgia. While my decision not to seek reelection was announced last January, the full impact of closing my career is just setting in.

I cannot pick up a file, walk down a House corridor or look out across the Capitol from my office, without the events of the past 12 years rushing back at me.

I can still remember my first introduction to Washington as if it were yesterday. It was President Eisenhower's first inauguration with all of the pomp and ceremony that is official Washington on such occasions.

This first official visit was marked by the assignment of my congressional office, the office I was to occupy for the next 12 years.

I think the thing that impressed me most about this first experience in Washington was the fact that only in America could a man of my humble origin be elected to the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Yet, here I was, one of 531 men, serving in the Legislature of the greatest Nation in the world. Subsequent decisions I was to participate in would not only touch the lives of 180 million Americans but, in reality, would affect the lives of over 2 billion people; since what is done in America must ultimately have an influence on the lives of all the world's people.

What a responsibility, what a privilege, what a challenge, and I am no less impressed today as I prepare to retire as I was then at the very beginning of my tenure in office.

From these early days onward, march a series of incomparable experiences that no newsletter could adequately reveal.

On one occasion it meant crouching in a trench in the Nevada desert witnessing the awesome spectacle of a mighty atom bomb explosion. On another occasion it meant hurtling through space crashing the sound barrier in a F–104B jet fighter. On still another occasion it meant landing on an aircraft carrier in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea.

But my most unforgettable moment was the day the House of Representatives was interrupted by the staccato sound of gunfire, and my colleagues and I found ourselves the target of a group of fanatical Puerto Rican nationalists attempting to impress Congress how badly they wanted independence.

Yet, all of my memories were neither exciting nor happy. First, there was the ever-present specter of death, which continued to take the lives of one and then another Member of the Congress, many of them young men and dear friends.

Then came the great tragedy, and I found myself standing in the Capitol rotunda paying my last respects, along with a grieving nation, to our late President, John F. Kennedy.

Nevertheless, these were just moments out of 12 exciting, productive years in Washington.

From the beginning, it seemes I was destined to fight my great battles over the spiritual rather than the material issues facing our Nation.

First, I introduced a resolution calling on the President of the United States to instruct our United Nations delegation to request that the General Assembly open each session with a prayer. Otherwise, I felt it would be futile to struggle for peace in an atmosphere which deliberately excluded God.

Unfortunately, this sincere gesture was blocked by our own American State Department. It was their contention that this action would offend Soviet Russia and her satellites. But then what sincere effort for peace has not offended the Communist world? Since that time, I have watched that noble, but illusive goal of peace, slip further and further from our grasp.

Next, was my long and frustrating fight to have the American flag follow our American servicemen in foreign lands.

This struggle involved my campaign against article 7 of the Status of Forces Agreement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This arrangement permitted foreign nations to prosecute American military men in their own courts. My position was that, since these were American servicemen, they were entitled to be tried in American military courts-martial where they understand the language, where the ideal of justice that "all men are innocent until proven guilty" prevails, and where hostile foreign citizenry cannot influence the outcome of the trial.

Here, once again, I crossed swords with our State Department. State argued that this abridgement of rights was necessary in order to placate the very nations that many of these same American servicemen had fought to liberate. While article 7 still stands, I did succeed in convincing our Government to make a vigorous effort to have foreign nations turn over American military personnel charged with a crime to the jurisdiction of the American military. Thus, today, the majority of all these cases are being tried in our military courts.

From these early battles to the still unfinished task of returning the right to pray to our public schools (of which you have read so much) there were many bills and many votes to contribute to a better and stronger America. Many of these votes were cast to save the taxpayers from the undue burden of spending in areas best served by the individual or the local and State government.

In making final judgment on the thousands of bills that came before me in my 12 years in Congress, I used three basic rules: Is it constitutional, is it good for my country, and can we afford it. If they passed this test, the bills received my support. If, however, they failed in any of these rules, they received my dissent.

Well, you might ask what does the box score show? How did you fare on the many crucial battles you fought on Capitol Hill? I must confess that I never kept a won and lost tally but then that really is not as important as honestly and sincerely believing you were right, and then fighting with all your might to make your point of view prevail. This I always tried to do.

Now, as I close this newsletter, I have one more journey to make and that will start with the long walk down through the subway that leads from this New House Office Building to the Capitol. There I plan to pay one last visit to the floor of the House of Representatives. It will be empty then. But for me, and, I guess, for any man who has served there, it will be filled with the voices of the men with whom he has served, as well as the voices of men reaching back to the very first Congress in 1789.

Then there will be, for me, that final rapping of the gavel as the Speaker of the House saying, "This Congress and the congressional career of the gentleman from New York stand adjourned, sine die."

And so with this last goodbye go my sincerest thanks, to you my constituents for affording me the privilege of serving you in the Congress, and to the thousands of you who worked so diligently every 2 years in my reelection campaigns. And finally, I wish to express my special thanks to the members of my Washington and Lynbrook staff for their devotion to duty and loyalty to me.

So again to you my heartfelt thanks, and now this newsletter too, stands adjourned "sine die".

With my very best wishes for you in the years ahead, I remain.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. BECKER.

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOORE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE REVEREND EDWARD J. COLES

(Mr. McCLORY (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it seems fitting to note, at this hour, the passing of a beloved citizen of Lake County and of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois—the Reverend Edward J. Coles, pastor of the First Baptist Church in North Chicago for the past 29 years.

Reverend Coles is identified by all as the father of Nat King Cole, the gifted and distinguished singer and entertainer who, himself, is combating illness at this time.

Reverend Coles has attained prominence in Illinois and in the Nation in his own right. Born in Montgomery, Ala., he came to Illinois in 1922 and after his religious studies and earlier ministry he became pastor of the First Baptist Church in North Chicago in 1935.

As a citizen and spiritual leader Reverend Coles' life has epitomized the best which humankind has attained. As a friend, husband and father he was beloved and respected.

When family, friends and spiritual and public leaders gather to pay their final respects to Rev. Edward J. Coles, they will be honoring a man of faith and humility, a man of warmth and loyalty, a man of great heart and great spirit, a man whose love flowed from the Father and who was and is beloved by all.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many others in this Chamber join me in this tribute to Rev. Edward J. Coles. In the name of the House of Representatives, and in my own behalf, I extend this expression of respect and sympathy to his beloved widow, Corabell, and to his children and other members of the family.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 26, 1965, when the House voted on House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, it was necessary for me to be absent from the city. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to recommit which would bar the use of any funds to finance the exportation of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. On January 11 and 12, 1965, 2 weeks before this vote was taken, I discussed this matter and my position on it as is shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE HONORABLE JIMMY QUILLEN, OF TENNESSEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a distinct pleasure and honor to rise today to commend my colleague and fellow 88th Club Member, the Honorable JIMMY QUILLEN, of Tennessee, on his superior vote-getting ability, in a year when, regrettably, our party suffered great losses throughout the country. In the First District of Tennessee, which JIMMY represents in this Congress, he polled more than 72 percent of the total vote cast. At any time, this would be an outstanding achievement. This is a direct tribute to the type of service which JIMMY QUILLEN instituted during his first term in the House of Representatives, his dedication to duty and his desire to do more than necessary—to "go the extra mile" in determining the problems and interests of his constituency, and to address himself to those problems and interests in a direct, forthright, and resolute manner.

It is an encouraging fact and a credit to JIMMY QUILLEN'S constituency that they have recognized and returned so overwhelmingly this outstanding public servant to the Congress of the United States. I look forward to serving with JIMMY for many years to come.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in offering congratulations and our appreciation for the fine record and vote-getting ability of Representative JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN, of the First District of Tennessee.

He was the top Republican vote getter in the Nation on November 3, 1964, having received a total of 72 percent plus of the votes cast in his election.

It is fitting that we honor him in recognition of this outstanding accomplishment, of which we are all justifiably proud.

JIMMY QUILLEN won the nomination in a hard fought, five-man primary battle in 1962, then went on to win the 1962 general election by a small margin; his per-

at the completion of "the sixth grade in school accredited by any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The community language in Puerto Rico is Spanish, but the capacity to understand and to communicate develops as well through one language as another, and English is taught in the schools in Puerto Rico beginning with the first grade. Therefore, pupils who have gone through the sixth grade have considerable command of English, sufficient to understand and write it well.

No one will quarrel with the contentions that voters should have certain basic equipment in order to vote intelligently. Certainly, the electorate should be aware of the issues. Literacy is a reasonable requirement to assure minimum understanding. I believe the demarcation point of "the sixth grade" proposed in my bill is reasonable.

I feel that the completion of a sixth-grade education is ample demonstration of literacy. We must not deny any citizen who is demonstrably literate the right to register and vote in any election. To prevent such injustice, I urge early approval of my bill.

(Mr. GILBERT (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GILBERT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE RETIREMENT OF ED REARDON

(Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, when the 89th Congress convened at the beginning of the year, a familiar face was missing from the House Press Gallery. For my good friend, Ed Reardon, had retired.

Ed Reardon served for many years with distinction as the Washington correspondent of the Herald-News, a daily newspaper which is published in Passaic, N.J., in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

Ed Reardon has served in the highest tradition of journalism. He has been painstakingly accurate, and he has never engaged in sensationalism or half-truths. As an individual, he is unfailingly kind and decent. While serving his newspaper in Washington, he came to be widely known and respected by many in the Nation's Capital and in the Halls of Congress. We will miss him, but we hope that Ed will be busy in retirement, enjoying all the good things life has to offer.

MORE SUPPORT FOR SHORTER CAMPAIGNS

(Mr. MONAGAN (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a stanch advocate of legislation to shorten presidential campaigns and as a sponsor of H.R. 96 and House Joint Resolution 16 which I have filed for this purpose, I was gratified to read a report of the speech made by Mr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. at the annual meeting of the Institute of Life Insurance in New York on December 8, 1964.

Mr. Stanton made several timely and important suggestions in keeping with the improvement of our election practices to bring them into line with the demands and realities of modern life and to take full advantage of the tremendous present day advances in electronic communications.

Mr. Speaker, the expression "too long, too expensive, too arduous" which I have often used in my arguments in favor of my proposal to limit presidential campaigns to 60 days was used effectively by Mr. Stanton in his comments concerning the 1964 campaign. With permission to extend my remarks and in further support of my proposals to limit Presidential campaigns to 60 days, I include herewith a portion of Mr. Stanton's December 8, 1964 speech:

TOO LONG, TOO EXPENSIVE, TOO ARDUOUS

If the electorate was bored and disgusted, there is evidence that the candidates were exhausted and perhaps even remorseful. After the campaign was over, the Democratic Vice Presidential candidate said, "What we really find ourselves doing with these long, extended campaigns of 2 to 3 months is replaying old material. And it loses a quality of its spontaneity and its freshness, and therefore I think that you [the candidate] tend to become tired the public becomes a little tired." His opponent, the Republican Vice Presidential candidate, agreed that the campaign was "too long, too expensive, too arduous, and too boring for the public."

The depressed level of the campaign of 1964 was reflected in the turnout on Election Day. Only 61.3 percent of eligible voters went to the polls, as compared to an alltime high of 64 percent 4 years ago, in 1960. And while the 1960 vote represented an increase of more than 11 percent in the number of voters casting their ballots over that of 1956, the 1964 vote amounted to an increase of only 1.5 percent over that of 1960, despite a 6 percent rise in the number of eligible voters. (Of the 1.5 percent increase in ballots cast, one-fifth was accounted for by the District of Columbia which was enfranchized for the first time since 1800.)

This could have come as no surprise to anyone who followed the uninspired and uninspiring use of communications in the 1964 campaign. Compared to the peak audience of 75 million that witnessed the Presidential debates of 1960, the peak audience of any political broadcast in 1964—the night before the election—was only 16 million. And the rate at which television audiences watched the other paid, set-piece political programs of 1964, compared to the average audience of 71 million for all four debates in 1960, is no less persuasive evidence that something is tragically wrong with the role that today's communications are permitted to play in American political life.

ALTERED CONTEXT OF POLITICAL LIFE

It takes no mystical insight to see where the trouble lies to a great extent. The fact of the matter is that, instead of using the great communications advances of our time, the political forces in this country have been resisting them—commanding them, like latter-day Joshuas commanding the sun, to stand still while the politicians do business at the old stand in the old way. And the citizen is expected to carry out electoral duties paced and dictated by the rapid complexities of the 20th century in accordance with the slow simplicities of the 19th. There is an ugly and dangerous anachronism in the facts of our scientific and political life. The Vice-President-elect put this bluntly enough after the election when he said, "we are going to have to catch up politically with the developments in science."

But we are not going to bring our political processes into line with the scientific realities of our time unless we face some elementary truths. Primary among these is the need for a clearheaded, realistically coordinated, and bona fide effort on the part of our political leaders and our political representatives to accept the fact that electronic communications have profoundly altered the context of political life today—and altered it to the good. And we need to adapt our old political processes to this new reality. We need this done now—when, since there is no campaign either current or immediately impending, there is no question of advancing or impeding the interest of any one party or of any one candidate.

PRISONERS OF AN UNWORKABLE RELIC

So far as the public interest goes, the people of this country are the prisoners of a discredited and unworkable legal relic of a generation ago: Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, which requires equal time to be given by broadcasting stations to all candidates of all political parties, major or minor, for an office—and there were 12 parties with candidates for the Presidency in 1964—if time is given to the candidates of any party for that office. It was the suspension of this legislation by joint congressional resolution for the 1960 Presidential and Vice Presidential campaign that made possible the Kennedy-Nixon debates and other types of broadcasts involving the candidates. It was the failure to suspend or repeal the section that, for all practical purposes, made similar confrontations between the major Presidential candidates in 1964 impossible.

Despite the almost unanimous editorial voice of American newspapers, despite the repeated requests of broadcasters, despite the demonstrably and widely acclaimed success of the 1960 suspension, there has been no resolute, conclusive legislative action getting rid, for once and for all, of the obstructive equal-time restrictions.

They will not be gotten rid of unless—and until—the electorate of this country speaks with such a loud and unmistakable demand that neither political stalling nor parliamentary juggling can silence or contradict it. For it is section 315 that keeps our political methods a century behind our communications.

SENSELESSLY PROLONGED CAMPAIGN

Once this log jam is broken, the way will be clear to taking a new look at the decrepit political practices that, having long outlived their point and their usefulness, hamper rather than advance the sensitive and difficult business of self-government.

Not the least of these outdated usages is the senselessly prolonged campaign between the conventions and the election. A hundred years ago, 3 months and more were necessary for the candidates to travel around the more than 3 million square miles of this country in order to be seen and heard by the voters. Even then, only a microscopic percent of the electorate ever saw any of the candidates or even heard them. Day after day of repetitious speeches, mile after mile of tedious travel, rally after carefully staged rally—after weeks of all this, the electorate was an emotional bundle of impressions far more often than an informed judge of qualifications.

And yet 12 years have gone by since this outmoded and outworn ritual, with its unnecessary expense of time and constantly increasing expense of money, has been made obsolete by advances in electronic communications.

As long ago as January 1953, William S. Paley, chairman of CBS, put the case very clearly: "I would like to present for the earnest consideration of the two major political parties," Mr. Paley said, "the proposal that the national conventions should start around September 1. Allowing 3 weeks for the completion of the nominating process, this would leave approximately 6 to 7 weeks for the two candidates to present their cases to the people. The effective use of television and other media of communication, combined with the basic minimum traveling demands required by political necessity, would, in my judgment, enable the candidates to register a deep and pervasive impact on the electorate during this 7-week period." The experience of the 1960 presidential campaign suggests that, with the unfettered use of television, the campaign could be even shorter—perhaps no longer than a month.

PRICE FOR THE DELAY MOUNTS

The reform is now long overdue. Every year the price for the delay mounts—not only in huge campaign costs, but also in terms of the suspension of normal legislative and executive functioning, uncertainty among other nations as to our future policies, and the bitterness at home that becomes inevitable as charges and countercharges stretch out interminably.

No constitutional and no statutory barrier stands in the way of the realistic and forward step suggested by Mr. Paley 12 years ago. Given the repeal of section 315, to rid electronic communications of the equal-time straitjacket, all that is required—beyond a clear look at the facts—is action by the two major party's national committees, which have been fixing the dates of nominating conventions for over a hundred years. During that span of time presidential campaigns have varied in length from 25 to 10 weeks.

THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT DESIGNED TO RETRAIN UNEMPLOYED WORKERS IN AREAS OF SERIOUS UNEMPLOYMENT

(Mr. PERKINS (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was designed to establish programs to retrain unemployed workers in areas of serious unemployment.

The requirement that the State and local government match these funds, while theoretically sound, all but nullifies this act in areas where it is most needed. These economically depressed areas are not only losing population but property values are dropping rapidly and in many cases large corporations, which paid a substantial portion of the taxes in the area, are disappearing either by a voluntary secession of operations or through bankruptcy.

The tax base loss from such economic developments is quite serious, and it is further decreased by the fact that a substantial number of the wage earners who, were they employed, would maintain normal income and property values for the business firms in the area, now contribute nothing to the economic health of the area.

If we are to make this program effective in areas where it is most needed, we must remove the requirement for State matching funds. The amendment to the act, which I have introduced today makes it possible to maintain a sound, well-rounded, manpower training act in those economically depressed areas which most need such a program.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, FEBRUARY 16

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, all of us need to be reminded that February 16 marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. We need to be reminded of this anniversary because it marks the day when a valiant people succeeded in proclaiming their independence after centuries of subjugation and of rule by external authorities.

All the liberty-loving people of the world rejoiced on that day in February 1918 because of this significant democratic victory. The free peoples of the world observed with appreciation and admiration the rapid strides which this small and new Lithuanian Republic made in its form of government and in the social, economic, and cultural fields.

Unfortunately, it was for only a brief span of a score of years that this progressive young nation could enjoy its achievements and its independence. All too soon, its self-determination and its sovereignty were lost and its people made vassals of a bigger and more powerful nation.

Although successfully fighting Russian maneuvers and attempts to engulf it for 3 years, Lithuania was illegally incorporated into the Soviet Union as its 14th republic.

Since this event, the plight of the people of Lithuania has been and is today tragic. Almost overnight the progress made and the institutions developed under the banner of equality and freedom were wiped out.

The Soviet Union stands before these people and their relatives who have fled to freedom elsewhere as a tyrant and a bullying oppressor. The United States and other freedom-loving nations have never recognized the legality of this Soviet steal. I trust that we never yield to any persuasions to recognize the infamous act of the U.S.S.R. in swallowing up a proud and free nation which gave such promise as did Lithuania.

Today as never before we need to continue to maintain our guard to prevent similar illegal Communist moves being enforced against other nations of the world. This Lithuanian Independence Day anniversary should make us more determined to combat Communists and communism in all its evil intentions. This day should remind us not only of those great men and women again living under foreign domination in Lithuania but it should remind us of that fine segment of American citizens—the Lithuanian-born Americans and the Americans born of Lithuanian parents. We join them in celebrating this independence day and we congratulate them on the great and constant contribution which they continue to make to our country. On this anniversary we renew our pledge to do our utmost to hasten the day when once more Lithuania can truly celebrate its independence day.

HORTON AMENDMENT FOR PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY AND SUCCESSION

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1963, the late Senator Estes Kefauver opened an inquiry into presidential inability pleading for statesmanship. He said:

> We are very fortunate that this country now has a young, vigorous, and obviously healthy President. This will allow us to explore these problems in detail without any implication that the present holder of the office is not in good health.
>
> The essence of statesmanship is to act in advance to eliminate situations of potential danger. * * *

Before the year was out, both the Senator from Tennessee and the "young, vigorous, and obviously healthy President" to whom he had referred were dead. The lessons implicit in this ironic twist of circumstances are too apparent to require extended elaboration. No one, regardless of station, has anything more than a day-to-day lease on life. We are in all respects tenants at will or sufferance.

Despite universal awareness of this grim imperative and notwithstanding the classic examples of Presidents Garfield and Wilson, the Congress has comported itself as if the facts were otherwise. Under the impact of each succession or tragedy involving our Nation's highest officers, we have marched up the hill of legislative action firm in our resolve to find a solution. As the emergency subsided, we have marched down again bearing only unfulfilled promises.

In Dallas, as on seven previous occasions, a Vice President became President as a result of the incumbent's death. Although there was some little discussion about what he succeeded to—the office or the powers and duties—President Johnson took an oath to become President.

But what happens when a President is incapacitated for some reason and is unable to perform his duties? Can the Vice President act in his place? Who determines whether the President is incapable of acting? Who decides when he has recovered?

The Constitution's vagueness in these particulars has occasioned perplexity and discomfiture for more than a century. The circumstances surrounding the death of President Kennedy have taught us that we can no longer afford the uncertainty that presently exists.

I have today introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing a solution to the problems of presidential inability and succession. Under the terms of my proposal, the inability of the President may be established by a declaration in writing of the President. Similarly, it would provide that the ability of the President to resume his powers and duties also shall be established by his declaration in writing. To insure that the President may regain his powers and duties as soon as he is able to discharge them after relinquishing them himself to the Vice President, I have included language providing that the President may resume his duties and powers immediately upon declaring his inability at an end.

In the event that the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as Congress shall provide do not concur in the decision of the President, the matter would be resolved by the veto of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress. Should the House and Senate fail to act promptly, the President would automatically resume his powers and duties 10 days after declaring the termination of his inability.

In the event the President fails or is unable to declare himself incapacitated, it may be established by the Vice President with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or by such other body as the Congress may provide.

In order to still the recurrent controversy that accompanies each succession, the proposal would provide that in the event of death, resignation, or removal of the President, the Vice President shall succeed to the office for the unexpired term.

Because of the transformation of the Vice-Presidency from an office of obscurity to one of growing influence and national prominence, it is important that it be filled at all times. Under my proposal, when a vacancy occurs in the vice-presidential office, the President would be authorized to nominate a person who, upon confirmation by a majority of the Congress, would become Vice President for the unexpired term.

Mr. Speaker, divine providence has given us a renewed opportunity for statesmanship. To miss the opportunity again could amount to a mortal omission.

HORTON BILL FOR PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the important recommendations made to Congress by the Warren Commission was that legislation be enacted making it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President, the Vice President, any officer next in the line of succession to the Presidency, and President-elect, or the Vice-President-elect. Similar provisions are needed to protect members of the President's Cabinet and Members of Congress as well.

Bills for this purpose, including my proposal of November 27, 1963, were submitted in the Second Session of the 88th Congress, but action was not taken. One of them passed in both the House and Senate as long ago as 1902, but failed of enactment by disagreement in conference between the House and Senate. Such a bill should be enacted now.

The Senate sponsor of the bill introduced in 1902, Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, spoke as follows on the resaon for making such homicidal attacks punishable under Federal law:

> What this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of the United States and the destruction of its security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important for this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour.

Congress long ago made it a Federal offense to attack or murder various categories of Federal employees, including Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, customs agents, and postal inspectors. By this bill the full resources of the Federal Government would be brought into action in case of any future attack upon the President or those in the line of succession to him, just as they now may be brought to bear if those lesser officials I have named are subjected to murderous violence.

The Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate properly waited for the recommendations of the Warren Commission in this matter. The recommendation has now been made unequivocally. The case for making physical attack upon the President and those in the line of succession a Federal crime is so clear that there is no occasion for delay. Even if there had been no tragedy at Dallas and no failures on the part of State authorities in the custody of the alleged assassin, it would still be eminently desirable to extend the added protection of a Federal statute around the President and all those who would succeed him in the event of his death or disability.

If this bill is enacted, it will mean that Federal law-enforcement officers must investigate such crimes against our highest officials. The Warren Commission report has noted that, as it is now, such Federal agencies as the FBI participate in investigations of the heinous crime of presidential assassination "only upon the sufferance of the local authorities." Moreover, the Commission has pointed out that the enactment of this bill would "insure that any suspects who are arrested will be Federal prisoners, subject to Federal protection from vigilante justice and other threats."

We have a duty to the memory of the late President to enact this bill. We have a duty to the administration of criminal justice by our Federal Government to enact this bill. We have a duty to the preservation of our constitutional system of government to enact this bill.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. DERWINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

(Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation—recommended by the President—which will again amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

You and the Members of this House will recall, I am sure, that when I asked your support for the original Manpower Development and Training Act program, in February 1962, I stated that "this is the first of many steps we must take if we hope to eventually eliminate our unemployment problem."

In December of 1963 I requested the support of the Members for amendments to this act as the first year's experience in administering the program had revealed the need for providing basic academic education—along with occupational training—if we hoped to reach the hard-core unemployed. Other changes were made at that time also, and all were directed toward eliminating roadblocks discovered in our attempt to retrain the unemployed. These were some of the "additional steps" I had said we would probably have to take.

Today I am introducing additional amendments which we have found to be necessary if we hope to enjoy full employment in this Nation.

The Manpower Development and Training Act has proved that it can get our unemployed workers back into the active labor market. The records show that between 70 and 80 percent of all those retrained under this program are gainfully employed. Not only have these people been made active participants in our economy but, above all, they have regained their self-respect, for they were all eager to return to the ranks of the taxpayers rather than remain on the public relief rolls.

Only last week the city of Pittsburgh—a part of which is in my congressional district—reported that retraining courses for jobless workers are saving the taxpayers of the city $35,000 a month in relief payments. I am sure that similar conditions exist in the districts of many other Members.

The continuation of this program is certainly necessary and, I am happy to say, it has gained the support of all segments of our Nation—industry, labor, education, government, and even the average citizens who belong to no specific group or organization.

Because of its noncontroversial nature, I anticipate early passage of this legislation.

The need for its uninterrupted continuation is mandatory and, for this reason, the Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, has scheduled public hearings on these amendments starting tomorrow, February 4. The

Secretary of Labor, the Honorable Willard W. Wirtz, will be our opening witness; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, will testify on February 5; with Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, the legislative director for the AFL-CIO, scheduled to testify on February 10.

Additional hearings will be scheduled, and it is my hope that in the very near future, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will be reported to the House for final passage.

With the unanimous consent of the House, I am appending to my remarks a brief explanation of the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act proposed by the administration:

OUTLINE OF PROVISIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

1. Termination date: Removes the June 30, 1966, termination date of the title II provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

2. Job development programs: Directs the Secretary to stimulate and assist job development programs to fill service needs which are not being met because of a lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment.

3. Experimental and demonstration programs: Expands the Secretary's research authority under title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act so that he may undertake experimentation and demonstration projects, and make grants to or contract with appropriate organizations for such purposes.

4. Labor mobility demonstration projects: Extends authority to conduct such projects for 2 more years, increases appropriations for such projects from $4 million to $5 million a year, removes the language which restricts the type of relocation expenses covered by the section to transportation costs and grants to 50 percent of such costs, adds provisions dealing with loans, and makes the provisions a part of title I, repealing section 208 accordingly.

5. Trainee bonding demonstration projects: Further amends title I to provide for demonstration projects to assist in the placement of trainees who have difficulty in securing bonds required for employment. Not more than $200,000 for fiscal year 1966 and $300,000 for fiscal year 1967 is authorized for such projects.

6. Training allowances:

(a) Extends period of training allowance support from 1 to 2 years.

(b) Changes eligibility requirements to permit single persons without dependents to receive training allowance.

(c) Increases training allowances by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of six.

7. Revision of limitation on number of youths who may receive training allowances: The act presently provides that not more than 25 percent of those receiving training allowances may be under the age of 22. This provision is amended to enable the Secretary of Labor to make such adjustments as administrative necessity may require.

8. Transportation allowances: Permits the payment of transportation allowances for daily commuting between the residence and the place of training.

9. Outside work for on-the-job trainees: Permits on-the-job trainees to engage in up to 20 hours of outside work without a reduction in their training allowance.

10. Matching funds: Matching for training allowances and HEW training programs may be combined and is put on a 90–10 basis. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind.

11. Appropriations:

(a) The present monetary limitations in section 304 of the Manpower Act on authorizations authorized for each title are replaced by an open-end authorization for the whole act.

(b) Makes it clear that costs of training allowances as well as institutional costs approved in any fiscal year may be paid out of funds appropriated for that fiscal year. Also permits the non-Federal contribution to be based on the matching requirement in existence at the time the training program is approved. (Thus, training programs approved before June 30, 1965, will not require matching by the States, even though payments to States are made after that date.)

12. Area Redevelopment Act: Authorizes special funds under the Manpower Act for training programs in areas designated as redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act to be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and HEW pursuant to the MDTA, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and with full Federal financing. The need for the separate training provisions now in the Area Redevelopment Act is thus eliminated and the training requirements in all areas can be conformed to the maximum extent practicable.

13. Miscellaneous: Technical changes are made in the method of computing the average weekly unemployment compensation payment in the States, upon which weekly training allowances are based.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 20 minutes, on February 4.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 30 minutes, on February 3.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 5 minutes, on Thursday, February 4, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNT.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNGER in three instances.
Mr. MOORE in three instances.
Mr. MACGREGOR.
Mr. RUMSFELD in three instances.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM in two instances.
Mr. CONTE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BECKWORTH.
Mr. MULTER in three instances.
Mr. GRABOWSKI in five instances.
Mr. UDALL in two instances.
Mr. COOLEY in two instances.
Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.
Mr. MATTHEWS.
Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.
Mr. BOLLING.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of thefollowing titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 701. An act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

490. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on supply support deficiencies contributing to high deadline rate of air defense equipment at an oversea location, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

491. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aviation units of the Eighth U.S. Army, Korea, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

492. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aircraft of the Seventh U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

493. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 858 (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

494. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to make uniform for all commodities, for which a marketing quota program is in effect, provisions for reducing farm acreage and producer allotments for falsely identifying, failing to account for disposition, filing a false acreage report, and for harvesting two crops of the same commodity